STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
10 September 1996 - Minutes

1. INTRODUCTION

COL James L. Williams opened the twentieth meeting of the Standards Coordinating Committee (SCC) by welcoming the SCC participants and recognizing the new representatives: Col Scott Hammell, U.S. Air Force, and Mr. James D. Buckner. A complete list of attendees is attached at Appendix A. COL Williams introduced Mr. Buckner who will succeed COL Williams as Chairman of the SCC. Mr. Buckner came from the Standard Systems Group at Gunter Air Force Base, Alabama, to accept an appointment to the Senior Executive Service and Deputy Commander of the Center for Standards (CFS). COL Williams stated that he regretted that the Interoperability Improvement Panel (IIP) would not be meeting the following day. It has always been an objective to have the two meetings coordinated to hold down travel and other related costs. COL Williams and Mr. Buckner gave opening remarks before introducing the agenda and the first speaker of the meeting.

2. CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT OF THE JOINT TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE (JTA)

Ms. Virginia Conway replaced Mr. Raj Ramaswami as the CFS lead for Joint Technical Architecture Configuration Management. She said that Dr. Kaminski and Mr. Paige had approved and signed the JTA. In her opening comments, she stated that today's briefing was an information briefing for the SCC. Ms. Conway stated that in the near future a decision will have to be made concerning the CM of the JTA. Ms. Conway also informed the group that no decision had been made on the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) chair for the JTA.

She presented an overview of the proposed JTA Configuration Management process which includes: the organization, schedule, and ground rules for the JTA Configuration Management. The SCC is comprised of subordinate committees that carry out the various functions. Technical efforts are the responsibility of existing Standards Management Committees (SMCs). These include: Information Transfer Standards, Information Standards, Information Processing Standards, Security Standards, Imagery Standards, and the Committee on Open Electronic Standards. These SMCs report to the SCC or the JTA Management Group (JTAMG), depending on the issues.

The JTAMG is a subset of and subordinate to the SCC. The JTAMG looks at the scope and domain of the standards issues and performs duties similar to a configuration management group. Issue resolution and approval still remain functions of the full SCC.

Ms. Conway stated that there are three phases included in the schedule for Configuration Management of the JTA. Phase 1 is Scope Determination. During this phase the JTAMG will determine what new domains need to be added to the JTA. This phase overlaps with the previous cycle of scope determination. Phase 2 of the process will be to determine content. This phase will require about three months to complete. The SMCs will take the lead in this phase and the JTAMG will meet twice to coordinate proposed standards. Phase 3 involves final coordination and publication of the approved document and will take approximately two months. This phase includes public comment and formal coordination. The JTAMG will meet to resolve comments. Unresolved issues will be forwarded to the SCC which will meet as necessary during this phase.

Membership of the JTAMG is comprised of O-6/GM-15 level individuals who represent domain interests. The members will provide feedback from the users of the standards. In addition, the JTAMG members will represent the acquisition and development communities. Decisions reached by the JTAMG will be consensus based. Ms. Conway said that current plans include developing one major and one minor revision per year. The major revision will include a change of scope. In closing, Ms. Conway said that a current plan for Version 2.0 of the JTA is to add the sustaining base requirements to the scope.

3. SCC INFORMATION PROCESSING STANDARDS BRIEFING

Ms. Virginia Conway introduced the briefing as a presentation of the JTA development process and the Information Technology Standards Guidance (ITSG) process.

The JTA process has evolved from the ITSG through the Adopted Information Technology Standards (AITS), Volume 7 of the Technical Architecture Framework for Information Management (TAFIM). Subsequent development occurred with the use of the Army Technical Architecture (ATA) as a baseline document which finally evolved into the approved JTA.

Ms. Conway said that the current IT standards documents include the ITSG, AITS, and JTA. She stated that the interim proposal for Volume 7 of TAFIM is to establish an initial policy

section followed by the JTA in chapter 1 and AITS in chapter 2. Subsequent TAFIM updates may find the AITS totally replaced by the JTA which could become the new Volume 7.

There was discussion regarding a number of unresolved issues. Should there be a document to address emerging or non-mandated standards? How should service supplements be promulgated? Ms. Conway stated that a standard cited by a single service will stand separate from the JTA main body. When a second service adopts the standard, it will be elevated to the main portion of the JTA.

Ms. Conway presented the current activities of the Information Processing Standards Department. First, Version 3.1 of the ITSG was released for SD-1 coordination on 10 September 1996. She said that comments are due to the CFS by 10 December 1996. In addition, the Information Processing Steering Group (IPSG) has been reactivated to operate as a management group rather than a conflict resolution committee.

Ms. Conway said the Information Processing Department was is in the process of automating the ITSG. She then described the current effort of automating the Information Technology Standards Database (ITSDB). The SD-1 process will facilitate the automation of the ITSDB. Further, the configuration management of the ITSDB, which is now informal, is being formalized.

In closing, Ms. Conway discussed the departments' future activities. These include installing an automated ITSG on the CFS World Wide Web (WWW). Other future activities include the development of automated tools and the maintenance of an automated source for IT standards information.

4. SCC ISSUE BRIEFING: COUNTRY CODES

CDR Rocky Wells provided a briefing on IIP action item 19-26. He stated that during the 6 June 1996 IIP a potential interoperability problem was reported. The issue is the possible confusion between Country Code (CC) and Target/Product Designator (TPD). He said that automated systems may miscorrelate Country Code and Target/Product Designator when received from multiple sources. (This miscorrelation could result in multiple tracks of a single target the erroneous merging of targets due to confusion of country and origin, and security violations if information is released to other parties based on target country).

CDR Wells explained that codes representing countries in tactical and intelligence systems exist in two domains. Geographical/political areas or entities are represented as Country Codes. Special intelligence targets appear as Target/Product Designators. Neither domain is a subset of the other. They are created for different purposes and scopes and are managed under different constraints. Neither domain is completely managed by the DOD.

Tactical and Intel systems have historically used separate, non-interactive databases. They had different purposes and security access characteristics and had no requirements for harmonization. In today's environment, fused systems are becoming more prevalent and errors may be introduced by parsers improperly correlating CC with TPD, the use of tables not current with standards, or human error during manual entry.

CDR Wells said that the standard for the Department of State and National Defense Programs is Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 10-4. This was mandated by public law and allows no exceptions. FIPS 10-4 is implemented by the DOD Defense Intelligence Agency Manual (DIAM) 65-18. This is promulgated in DDDS, but change procedures are currently inadequate. The DIAM 65-18 and Defense Data Dictionary System (DDS) are outdated and still reflect the older FIPS 10-3.

CDR Wells then provided an overview of the Geospatial Standards Management Committee (GSMC) proposal and illustrated some focal points that were being suggested. One of the pivotal focal points is that the custodianship of FIPS 10 be transferred to the Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) for maintenance. The DMA has accepted the DIA proposal to assume responsibility of DIAM 65-18 with the intent of retiring the manual when FIPS 10 incorporates the delta of policy. The DMA will submit changes to the DDDS to reflect FIPS 10-4 changes.

Once the DMA proposal is submitted with changes to the DDDS, the services will identify databases using both CC and TPD inputs for review to ensure proper use of data. The National Security Agency (NSA) will submit a proposal that will harmonize or deconflict CC and TPD lists, and the United States Message Text Format (USMTF) will develop a message format to clearly delink the data items. Several members stated that this was a CC/TPD training issue. Other issues that need to be resolved include commercial as well as Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) items. COL Williams recommended that the SCC fully support the resolution of the issue.

5. WORKFLOW STANDARDS

Dr. Dan Wu presented an overview of workflow and associated standards. Workflow is an automation technology. It is an automated system for routing, approving, tracking, processing, and archiving documents/images/forms. Broadly speaking, it is the second phase of business process re-engineering (the first phase is process re-modeling). Dr. Wu stated that it is a mature technology involving more than 100 vendors. However, there are no standards.

Workflow speeds up business processes and is one of the Electronic Combat (EC) enablers that helps simplify documents/images/forms management. It increases productivity and results in significant financial savings. Dr. Wu stated that DOD and other government agencies are increasingly buying heterogeneous workflow products. He stated that interoperability is now needed among the many different products. A common client Application Program Interface (API) is needed to access different workflow engines because of the previously mentioned 100 plus vendors. A common vocabulary, process definitions, and standards are needed to interface with other technologies.

Dr. Wu indicated that the government intends to leverage the commercial standards effort for DOD use. DISA currently participates with the Workflow Management Coalition, an international workflow standards group of 187 members from 25 countries. The CFS has been sponsoring an interoperability standards project at the Coalition since Fiscal Year 1995.

He stated that a new workflow interoperability specification was drafted in FY95, finalized in FY96 and approved by the Coalition for formal release. With the CFS assistance, several vendors have demonstrated the feasibility of implementing this specification. Dr. Wu stated that this was a good example of how DOD and industry can work together. We have gained positive publicity (both Government Computer News and Federal Computer Week have reported our involvement). He indicated that the potential benefit is that it is very marketable. Estimates indicate that software products can reach almost one billion dollars a year. Workflow is one of the major technology enablers and the benefits for its usage are evident. The government, usually two years behind the commercial sector in techology, can benefit greatly from workflow. Workflow has been popular in the commercial sector for the last three years.

CFS will continue its participation in the Coalition and needs to develop a test suite to check

compliance with this specification. Workflow standards should be added to the TAFIM and JTA and provided to potential DOD customers, to include Washington Headquarters Services (WHS) and Defense Information Infrastructure (DII). Dr. Wu indicated that all workflow standards and related information are located at WWW address: http://armsnt.arms.ohio-state.edu/WfMC/

6. OBJECT MANAGEMENT STANDARDS ACTIVITIES

Mr. Huet Landry presented an information briefing on Object Management Standards. He summarized a list of Continuous Acquisition Life-Cycle Support (CALS) standards and specifications and the associated requirements for object technology. He stated that Object Management allows programmers to link attributes (data) to methods (actions) and helps simplify complex system programming.

He indicated that the industry consortia had many things that needed to be coordinated, including requirements, legacy and dreams, technology products, and standards such as conformance and interoperability. In the Open Group, the Combined X/Open and Open Software Foundation (OSF), there still needs to be conformance and interoperability testing, such as that provided by the Object Management Group (OMG).

Government participation in the OMG includes DISA, NSA, NraD, MITRE, and the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST). This group recently addressed such issues as Ada 95 mapping to OMG Interface Definition Language (IDL), security, and common facilities specifications.

CORBA use includes a Modernized Intelligence Database (MIDB) and is used for integrating Relational Data Base Management System (RDBMS) and images. The Common Imagery Interoperability Facility (CIIF) is common in APIs for Imagery Systems using OMG IDL. The Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) and Defense Medical Information Management System (DMIMS) also use the CORBA system.

Mr. Landry compared the MIDB and CIIF environments. The characteristics of MIDB are multiple platforms, multiple data sources, nonstandard DBMS access, service specific applications, multilevel classification, and complex management and maintenance. The CIIF environment has multiple platforms, multiple image formats, nonstandard image servers, DOD and federal applications, multilevel classification, and complex management and maintenance.

MIDB requirements exemplify the issue. An Intelligence Analyst uses information from image servers (CIIF IAS and CAF) and MIDB servers. The MIDB developer is faced with heterogeneous database access challenges to reach RDBMS, image, and text information. The General Inter-ORB Protocol (GIOP) provides common interface between CIIF at IIOP

(TCP/IP) and MIDB at ESIOP (DCE). MIDB Reference Implementation shows that the intelligence analyst gains access to RDBMS, image, and text via the CORBA server. The CIIF Prototype Implementation illustration also shows the enhancement of better client access.

In closing, Mr. Landry stated that the OMG and Open Group activities demonstrate the value of continuing partnerships. Examples include conformance and interoperability testing and metrics, CASE tool interoperability, imagery services, database connectivity, and security services. Customers and partners include the Central Imagery Office/ DMA (NIMA), Intelink subscribers, NSA, NRaD, MITRE, Objective Interface Systems, OC Systems, Gensym, IONA, CI Labs, Rational, and Texas Instruments.

7. SCC BRIEFING ON CALS

Mr. Alan Peltzman presented a briefing to update the SCC regarding Continuous Acquisition and Life-cycle Support (CALS). He explained that DISA, specifically the Center for Standards, is the Lead Standardization Activity (LSA) for Information Processing Standards for Computers (IPSC). These include CALS standards and specifications.

The categorization of these standards and specification shows that Military Standard 1840 is an interface standard; the remainder are performance specifications. He stated that CALS standards and specifications do not require waivers for use on contracts (DSIC Chairman's Memo of 1995-03-15). Mr. Peltzman gave a list of FY96 accomplishments which included data encryption, digital signature, security tagging, JCALS change pages, Navy raster, JEDMICS raster support, Year 2000 upgrades to 28000 series and 1840, incorporation of STEP (ISO 10303) and hyperlink/hypermedia capabilities.

CALS will respond to the Year 2000 (Y2K) problem (as described in Mr. Paige's memo). CALS will be a vehicle for accomplishing Y2K compliance and implementation throughout DOD and industry. Activities to support Y2K include creating the of CALS ISG Y2K committee, publishing the CALS Y2K strategy, upgrading the data exchange standards to Y2K (with the development Y2K-compliant CALS profiles for established standards such as EDI, IGES, SGML).

The CALS Resource Locator Web Page is http://www.fedworld.gov/edicals/locator.html. CALS Expo '96 is located at http://calsexpo.ecrc.gmu.edu.

8. POSIX/XOPEN OPERATING SYSTEM (OS) STANDARDS STATUS

Mr. Curtis Royster presented the status for POSIX/XOPEN Operating System Standards. He summarized the Warfighter Vision of operating system needs. The warfighter needs a fused, real-time, fault tolerant, true picture of the battlespace. He requires the ability to order, respond, and coordinate vertically and horizontally in order to execute the DOD mission in that battlespace using operating systems Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) products and services for weapons and Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence (C4I) systems to achieve interoperability.

Mr. Royster said that the DOD OS Standards Program needs a boost; the OS needs to keep up with today's demands. He presented a graphic that illustrated that multimedia, communications, business processes, environment management, database utilities, and engineering support are failing to keep up with user demands.

The DII Operating System areas of deployment include the Sustaining Base and deployed Joint Task Force. Public Law 104-133 states that COTS products should be made available for DOD systems using commercial standards based on the DOD mission. A graphic depicted why Operating System Standards are essential for portability and interoperability.

Mr. Royster answered several questions: What is OS Software Portability? Software portability implies that the same applications are executing on multiple platforms with few modifications. Portability includes OS, compilers, development tools, and language processors. Portability is information hiding. Portability models are either standards based (creating a portability model from API standards) or a target platform. Target platform has to select a specific set of platforms to support and a strategy to maximize portability across that specific set.

Why plan for OS Portability? Software must run on different systems over a lifetime. Writing portable code is an investment in the future. Technology platforms will change over a lifetime. Vendors should agree to a common set of OS APIs called standards. This will help minimize source code changes and put them in fewer places. We must create a Portability Layer (DOD specific functions). We should isolate system-specific and non-portable parts into a single library. We should use a toolbox (e.g. MKS Portability analyzer,

version control, configuration management).

Mr. Royster then presented the following Operating System enhancements planned for FY97: 64 bit extensions, multi-byte support extensions, and large DB file support, an OS common UNIX documentation DII tool for application compliance to COE and a COE NT/UNIX tool for DII applications; an OS requirement list that includes UDI over SCI avionics and OS avionics extensions; Ada for XTI/Sockets for real-time distances communications and uniform drivers, and secure print extensions and real time extensions that are fault tolerant. By the year 2000 date there will be Aspen thread extensions and POSIX threads.

The DOD OS return on investment can be demonstrated by the following accomplishments: the MKS Application Code Checker for proper DII/COE applications certification, and the Common single OS documentation for application developers when procuring a new OS release (example HP products). UNIX applications will port to WindowsNT using OPEN-NT. (OPEN-NT allows WindowsNT to function in UNIX.) Future operating systems will include Checkpoint Restart, Fault-Tolerant, and common device drivers for POSIX OS. We must inform Congress on ways to improve the DOD OS Standards program to ensure POSIX COTS products are available for weapons systems procurement. Next year, operating systems will provide real-time, threads, 64 bit, Y2K semantics, and DB large file support. A Conformance Testing Program exists for RT/Threads/Embedded Systems and other OS enhancements. POSIX is suitable for C4I, weapons systems, and embedded systems. Partnerships exist for DII with OS-JTF, JSF, COTS vendors, and DOD labs. OS portability errors and solutions were identified in the DII IRTS.

The DOD Operating System Standards Program can be rebuilt where all software components use operating systems services.

In conclusion, Mr. Royster stated that the operating system mission needs have steadily increased. They need the continued partnership support from DOD offices and industry such as DII, OS-JTF, CISA, JSF, OSD, X/Open, and IEEE to expedite commercial operating system standards. He also asked that these organizations continue giving DISA guidance and support for DOD OS Programs.

The Operating Systems FY96 accomplishments included: the use of a single UNIX standard no more proprietary UNIX the common UNIX documentation standard packaged with UNIX real-time services in UNIX; the use of Ada for sockets standard; and the operating systems

section for DII programmers guide. By the year 2000, there will be semantic fixes in both UNIX and POSIX. Portability errors in DII documentation were found and POSIX/XOPEN standards for the emerging section in the JTA were completed.

Lastly, Mr. Royster presented the Operating Systems FY97 plans which include the following: complete the DMS API for IEEE/XOPEN; complete a single UNIX standard with 64 bit enhancements and real-time; and finish a common UNIX documentation with DISN network services added with complete DMS API specification for Standards Working Group. Plans also include making Compliance MKS tool DII/COE 2.0 and 3.0; expediting POSIX standards with OSD (A&T/OSJTF and DDR&E) (Fault, avionics, real-time Embedded services, and device driver); providing help to DII staff on writing quality portable code using CMM; and producing one source code application set for DII platforms including MS-Windows and UNIX. Final plans are to conduct a Congressional POSIX study.

9. THE NEW DODI 4630.8

Mr. Jack Zavin made a presentation regarding DODI 4630.8 and Compatibility, Interoperability, Integration, and Security (CIIS) for the DII. DODI 4630.8 makes Compatibility, Interoperability, and Integration (CI&I) visible to all. It applies CI&I to all the means that DOD uses to obtain operational capability. This instruction empowers the Services/Agencies (S/As), Executive Agents and the acquisition community. It characterizes and certifies the CI&I. Furthermore, it provides for the incremental and interactive development of CI&I requirements and solutions.

Mr. Zavin discussed how the CIIS for DII had been influenced by C4ISR ITF, Security, Acquisition Management, Laws and Regulations, Current CII Process, Defense Information Infrastructure, Standardization Documents, and the Non-5000 processes and documentation. A chart was used to show the current CI&I Assurance Process as it corresponds with Milestones 0 through III. The standards approach will be presented in the MNS and ORD at Milestones 0 and I. The Preliminary Profile is found in the Systems Spec (Milestone I) while Conformance and Interoperability Testing is located in the TEMP (Milestone I). The Final Draft Profile is shown in the Systems Spec (Milestone II) and the Conformance Testing shows up in the TEMP (Milestone II). Prior to Milestone III the Standards Profile will be certified and Conformance and Interoperability Testing will be complete.

Mr. Zavin then presented the philosophy as it pertains to the development of the new directive

and the ground rules and assumptions used. He stated that the new directive is based on Process Re-engineering, not an update to the current CI&I process, and the CI&I with "S" handled by smart referral to appropriate DOD documents to allow for tradeoffs. Mr. Zavin stated that the procedures must apply to all of the ways that DOD gets operational capability that produces, uses, or exchanges information in any form electronically. The process must be pragmatic and focused on usability by the acquisition manager and user requirement generation communities with extension to others.

He stated that the new CI&I process will be re-engineered through a coordination group and a small focus group from the acquisition community. Further, the CI&I requirements and solutions will be developed as the program develops, not in totality at the beginning. He stated that the system CI&I capabilities must be verified prior to fielding in two phases: A learner's permit obtained via written test to allow characterization and growth of CI&I, and a driver's license obtained via road test prior to initial production decision and modifications that could affect CI&I.

The goal is to incorporate some or all of Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 6212.01 and to balance and link the responsibilities and authority of OSD; JS; the CINCs, Services, Agencies; and Executive Agents. Also the C4I Support Plan cited in the new 5000.2-R to make CI&I visible, must be adapted along with automated database tools and a Web Page to make CI&U visible. Like the new 5000 series, the new 4630.8 will contain mandatory procedures with discretionary practices and informational material included in the Defense Acquisition Deskbook. DOD must mandate the use of Operational, Technical, and Systems Architectures with discretionary material found in the Defense Acquisition Deskbook. The process must also address the mandatory levels of CI&I actual levels may be discretionary, and like the new 5000.2, the new 4630.8 may become a regulation (and be signed by DEPSECDEF).

Mr. Zavin stated that the Central Imagery Office (CIO) needs to know its roles and responsibilities and must be able to use the DII COE, the JTA, and the Architecture Framework. Development of the new directive is taking a nontraditional/non-5000 approach, and the Allied/Coalition Nations (including security assistance) must be able to use the Open Systems approach for the purchase of services.

10. NATO IPO UPDATE

Mr. Lou Pilla presented an overview of the NATO IPO issues. DISA funding has been approved for the first year. The Army and Air Force have consented to provide representatives for the IPO. There has not been a name provided for the Army representative. The Implementation Plan is being staffed at DISA. The approval of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is at risk pending a modification that would provide for the termination of resources at the five-year mark. The SCC members were requested to support the office when and if it comes into being.

11. WWW UPDATE

Mr. John Bridger acknowledged the recognition for his final briefing to the SCC. He presented an update for the Information Technology Standards Integrated Bulletin Board System (ITSI BBS) WWW modernization project. He said that the project timeline is on schedule. During September 1996, the library and working group contents will be transitioned to the WWW. The ITSI BBS will be shut down on 1 October 1996. Mr. Bridger then presented a project activities summary. He has briefed the SCC and SMCs regarding the Modernization Project. On 8 July 1996 he sent a message to the CINCs/Services/Agencies. Notifications and a WWW user guide were posted on the ITSI BBS and WWW. The new server software is online, and new Web applications have been developed and tested. The Standards Library is complete on the Web, and training sessions are being provided for "Webspinners." The transition of the Working Group contents is currently proceeding on schedule. The account transition is also underway.

12. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

COL Williams reviewed Action Item #1-96-05 Feedback of DOD Representatives and recommended that the SCC close the item. The SCC concurred with the recommendation. He indicated that the CFS will internally manage the procedures for improving feedback of DOD representatives to non-government standards fora into the IT standards process.

13. CLOSING REMARKS

COL Williams thanked the participants for their information briefings . Mr. Buckner said the SCC was an excellent forum for sharing issues and working out mutual problems. In closing, he said he was looking forward to working with the SCC members. The next meeting of the SCC is scheduled for 10 December 1996. COL Williams thanked all in attendance for their

time and support and adjourned the meeting at 1445.

APPENDIX A
STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE ROSTER
10 SEPTEMBER 1996

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name
DIA	Beckwith, MAJ B
OSD/C3I/Command & Control	Bennett, COL M
JIEO/CFS	Berrios, Mr. W
DMA	Blumberg, Capt R
DISA-CFS	Booker, Ms. A
JIEO/CFS	Bragg, Mr, N
Open Systems Joint Task Force	Burke, Mr. H.L
Co-Chairman SCC	Buckner, Mr. J
DCAA	Colison, Ms. J
JIEO/CFS	Conway, Ms. V
DISA/CFS	Cox, Mr. R
CIO	Goldsmith, Mr. R
DISA/CFS	Flanigan, Mr. W
Air Force/SCTA	Hammell, Col S
HQDA	Hendrick, Mr. T

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name
DISA/CFS	Jagger, LTC D
DLA	King, Mr. A
DISA/CFS	Kirsch, Ms. B
DISA/CFS	Landry, Mr. H
Joint Logistics Commanders C&E	Machado, Mr. J.
Joint Staff	Maher, Mr. J
DISA/JIEO	Martin, Mr. A
NRO	Meiey, Mr. E.J.
DISA	Miller, Ms. K.
JITC	Neuendorf, COL S.
NSA	Nunley, Dr. C.D.
OAO Corp	Parry, Mr. C
DMSO	Piesco, Mr. A
JIEO/CFS	Pilla, Mr. Lou
CECOM	Plant, Mr. J.
SPACECOM	Potter, Maj T
NRO	Propst, Mr. W.M.
STRATCOM	Ramsey, Mr. L
CWO/N62	Roqozinski, Mr. M
DAMO-FDQ	Salice, Mr. H
DISA/CFS	Spiller, Mr. L
NISMC	Vaughan, Mr. D.
DAMO-FDQ	Salice, Mr. H
DISA/JIEO	Wells, Mr. R.D.
Co-Chairman/SCC	Williams, COL James
JIEO	Yocan, Mr. F.A.

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name
OASD/CISA	**Zavin, Mr. J**

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name

APPENDIX B

STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
AGENDA
10 September 1996

0800-0815 INTRODUCTION - COL James L. Williams/Mr. James Buckner

0815-0845 JTA UPDATE - Ms. Conway

0845-0930 TAFIM VOLUME 7 - Ms. Conway

0930-1000 CCOUNTRY CODES OF THE WORLD - CDR Wells

1000-1030 WORKFLOW - Dr. Wu

1030-1045 BREAK

1045-1115 DOD OBJECT TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS STRATEGY - Mr. Landry

1115-1145 CALS - Mr. Peltzman

1145-1215 OSJTF/JTA/JSF POSIX - Mr. Royster

1215-1315 LUNCH

1315-1345 NEW DODI 4630.8 - Mr. Zavin, CISA

1345-1400 BREAK

1400-1415 NATO IPO UPDATE - Mr. Pilla

1415-1430 WWW UPDATE - Mr. Bridger

1430-1445 ACTION ITEM REVIEW

1445-1500 CLOSING REMARKS